

## REMARKS

The above-referenced application has been reviewed in light of the Examiner's Office Action dated July 19, 2006. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-12, 14 and 16-19 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's kind suggestions. No new matter has been added and no new issues have been raised. New dependent Claim 21 as been added. Therefore, Claims 1-21 are currently pending in this application. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested, particularly in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In accordance with the Office Action, Claims 2, 6, 10 and 17 drew objections for informalities of a generally typographical nature, where the "*n*" in the term " $1/2n$ " was supposed to be a superscript as set forth in the specification. The Examiner's kind suggestion to superscript the "*n*" is gratefully acknowledged. Accordingly, Claims 2, 6, 10 and 17 have been amended.

In accordance with the Office Action, Claims 3, 7, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for reciting "the data" without specifying whether "the data" referred to the write data and/or the read data. The Examiner's understanding is correct that "the data" means the write data when the data is input and the read data when the data is output. Accordingly, Claims 3, 7, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18 and 19 have been amended.

In accordance with the Office Action, Claims 1, 3-5, 11-16 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,559,450 to Ngai et al. Claims 1, 5, 9 and 16 have been amended.

The Examiner has interpreted Applicants' previous recitation of "a second port for inputting write data" as not limited to "only" inputting write data. Since the Claims are to be read in light of the specification, the term "only" may be read into these Claims. The "second or write-only port" was discussed in Applicants' response to the previous Office Action. Thus, no new issues have been raised. The '450 to Ngai et al. fails to teach or suggest "a second port for **only** inputting write data" as recited in amended Claims 1, 5, 9 and 16 (**emphasis** added).

In addition, the Examiner's attention is drawn to new Claim 21. New Claim 21 depends from Claim 2, which, in turn, depends from Claim 1. New Claim 21 recites the "device of Claim 2 wherein  $n$  is at least 2". Thus, the number of pins in the second or write-only port is less than or equal to  $\frac{1}{4}$  of the number of pins in the first or read/write port.

## Conclusion

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent Claims 1, 5, 9 and 16 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated above. Since Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-15 and 17-21 each depend from one of the above claims and necessarily include each of the elements and limitations thereof, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated, as well as for reciting additional patentable subject matter. Thus, each of Claims 1-21 is in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, reconsideration of the rejections and an early and favorable allowance of this case are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric M. Parham  
Registration No. 45,747  
Attorney for Applicants

## Correspondence Address:

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
130 Woodbury Road  
Woodbury, New York 11797  
Telephone: (516) 692-8888  
Facsimile: (516) 692-8889